

the characters which seem to point to evidently natural genera are so slight, that we are not in a position to reject arbitrarily any, whether based on colour or structure, that may serve our purpose. If the Trochilidæ are to be divided into any thing approaching the number of genera that have been proposed for them, we cannot afford to set aside any characters which, even if slight, have the merit of being definite.

IX.—*Letters, Announcements, &c.*

Mr. A. O. Hume sends us the following letter, and with it four skins of Indian birds for examination :—

GENTLEMEN,—The Marquis of Tweeddale recently addressed you a letter about *Pellorneum tickelli*.

I do not see that any advantage would result to ornithology from entering into any controversy with his Lordship ; but it is desirable that the distinctness or otherwise of the species referred to should be established.

I send you separately, for inspection, a specimen of what I identify as *P. tickelli*—a bird that occurs equally in Burmah and Assam. I trust you will kindly state, at the same time as you publish this letter, your views as to this supposed species.

There are a good many supposed species the validity or otherwise of which it would be satisfactory to determine. I venture to forward, for your inspection, specimens of three of these besides the *Pellorneum* ; and should you approve my proposals in this matter, I shall be glad to forward, from time to time, other specimens of similarly doubtful species.

A second species of which I send a specimen is *Trichastoma minor*, Hume, S. F. ii. 535, Oct. 1874. Is this identical with *Drymocataphus fulvus*, Wald. Ann. & Mag. N. H. June 1875, 401, or with *Turdinus garoënsis*, Godw.-Aust. J. A. S. B. xliii. 160, pl. viii. 1874 (read May 6th, published —)? or is it possible that all three are the same? I may mention that this species is very variable in the extent of pale shafting to the feathers of the head, and in the colour of the lower parts,

which in some are nearly uniform rufescent, while in others the middle of the throat and abdomen are white, or nearly so.

A third species is *Proparus dubius*, Hume, Pr. A. S. B. May 1st, 1874, 107 (when published?), and S. F. ii. 447, June 1874. Is this identical with *Minla mandellii*, Godw.-Aust. Ann. & Mag. N. H. Jan. 1876?

A fourth species is *Minla rufogularis*, Mandelli, S. F. i. 416, July 1873. Is this identical with *Minla collaris*, Wald. Ann. & Mag. N. H. Aug. 1874?

Yours &c.,

A. O. HUME.

[In accordance with Mr. Hume's suggestion, we have had great pleasure in submitting the four specimens sent by him to the examination of Lieut.-Col. Godwin-Austen, who has kindly supplied the following notes on them.

As regards the question at issue between Mr. Hume and Lt.-Col. Godwin-Austen (whether *Turdinus garoënsis* or *Trichostoma minus* agrees best with Blyth's description of *Pellorneum tickelli*), we believe it impossible to come to a satisfactory conclusion. The size of the specimens sent by Mr. Hume seems to us to favour his view. But if the exact original types cannot be positively ascertained (as would seem to be the case from Lt.-Col. Godwin-Austen's remarks in Pr. A. S. B. June 1877), it would be better, according to our views, to reject the specific name *tickelli* altogether, and adopt the first name *certainly* applicable to each of these two birds.—EDD.]

(1) Mr. Hume's "*Pellorneum tickelli*, Blyth, ♂ (from Sadia, Assam)," is the same as my *Turdinus garoënsis* ♂, from the Daffa hills. Slight differences exist between it and my type; but I should hesitate to describe it as another species.

(2) *Trichastoma minor*, Hume (corr. *minus*), = *Pellorneum tickelli*, Blyth, = *Dryocataphus fulvus*, Walden. See my paper in Pr. A. S. B. June 1877, where I placed this bird in the genus *Alcippe*. It is very close to my *Turdinus garoënsis*, which inhabits the Assam hills, and has been compared with the type, from which it differs in being more rufescent in

tinge, and in the pale nearly white centre of the breast and throat.

(3) *Proparus dubius*, Hume, I have compared with ten examples, and find very close to *Minla mandellii*, Godw.-Aust.; but it is white beneath, and wants the streaked white-and-black feathers behind the ear-coverts, is smaller, more rufous, and less striate on the head. In my opinion it is a good representative race, in the far south, of the Assam form. It is a true *Minla* in every respect. In the same way *Minla castaniceps*, from Tenasserim, is paler below than the specimens from the Assam hills. Both these local races exhibit a variation equal in kind and degree, which is very interesting.

(4) *Minla rufogularis*, Mand., = *Alcippe collaris*, Walden. I have compared it with a large series of the latter; *rufogularis* has priority as the title. *Minla mandellii* is quite a different bird, and cannot be confounded with it. Its correct generic title is *Minla*.—H. H. G.-A.

We have also received the six subjoined letters :—

Boston, November 13, 1877.

SIRS,—My young townsman, Dr. James C. Merrill, U.S.A., stationed at Fort Brown, Texas, continues to make interesting discoveries in this border region. Among these are the eggs of *Molothrus aeneus*, which you will find described in full in the 'Nuttall' for October. They are greenish white, and so far are found only in nests with eggs of a similar colour*.

He found last summer a colony of *Ibis guarauna* breeding in the swamps at the mouth of the Rio Grande. What he supposed to be *Parula americana* proves to be *P. pitiayumi*, a new bird to our already plethoric fauna. *Neocorys spraguei*, has been taken near Fort Brown (its most southern and eastern record).

In September last Dr. Merrill found a nest which, there is little doubt, belonged to a pair of *Amazilia cerviniventris* inside the enclosure of Fort Brown. "It was in the fork

* [See Robert Owen's account of the eggs of this bird, 'Ibis,' 1861, p. 61.—EDD.]

of a small, dead, drooping branch of a tree, on the edge of a path through a thicket. It was about seven feet from the ground, and contained the shrivelled body of a young bird. It is made of soft down from a high common about here, but of what plant is unknown to me, bound on the outside with cobwebs, and sparingly covered with lichens. Internally it measures less than an inch in depth. Its external depth is an inch and a half. This species is quite abundant on the reservation, frequenting dense thickets and narrow paths; it is restless and noisy, and is not easily obtained. It arrives in March, and leaves in October."

Yours, &c.,

T. M. BREWER.

SIRS,—I send you the following notes relative to the nesting of the *Zonotrichia coronata*, Baird, which I hope may not be without interest to the readers of 'The Ibis.'

The Golden-crowned Sparrow is one of our Pacific species, of whose history little is known. It is found in summer from California to Alaska, and in winter wanders as far south as Cape St. Lucas. Its most eastern point is Sierra Nevada, where it is known only as a straggler. Up to the present summer its nesting and eggs had remained unknown, the description given by Dr. Heermann of a supposed nest found near Sacramento being regarded as of questionable authenticity.

On the 14th of June, 1877, Mr. Ludwig Kumlien (son of the well-known ornithologist of Wisconsin, and now Naturalist with our expedition to establish an arctic colony), in Shosta County, California, on the banks of the Cloud River, was so fortunate as to secure the nest and eggs of this species, and the female parent.

The eggs were four in number, measure from 0·80 to 0·82 inch in length, and from 0·64 to 0·67 inch in their greatest breadth. They are of a rounded oval shape, and are but little more obtuse at one end than at the other. The ground-colour, like that of all the eggs of this genus, is a light

green, and is generally quite distinctly to be seen, as the small blotches of reddish- and golden-brown, with which the whole surface is pretty equally and uniformly marked, are nowhere confluent or even numerous. These eggs very closely resemble the very lightly marked varieties of *Z. albicollis*, but are smaller and in their shape more spheroidal.

The nest has an outer diameter of 5 inches, a height of 3 inches; and its cavity is $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches deep, with a diameter of the same dimensions at the rim. The base and periphery of the nest form a loosely interwoven mass of thin strips of bark, skeleton leaves, and coarse stalks and stems of plants. It is very thoroughly lined with fine wiry rootlets of wild plants and shrubs. It was in a low bush, just above the ground.

Evidently the eggs described by Dr. Heermann did not belong to a bird of this species; and the egg in the British Museum attributed to this Sparrow is incorrectly named, but it is not unlikely to be an egg of *Poæcetes gramineus*.

Yours &c.,

THOMAS M. BREWER.

233 Beacon Street, Boston.

October 10, 1877.

Northrepps, November 24, 1877.

SIRS,—During a recent visit to Newcastle I was enabled, through the kindness of Mr. Hancock, to examine two Buzzards which appear to me to be British-killed examples of *Buteo desertorum*. They are both in immature plumage, and remarkably resemble the dark-coloured phase of this Buzzard, of which specimens are occasionally sent to this country from Archangel. Both specimens are said to have been found to be males.

One of the two was killed at Bywell, near Newcastle, in 1830, and is now in Mr. Hancock's collection; its principal measurements are—wing 14·2 inches, tarsus 2·8, middle toe *s. u.* 1·3. The other was obtained at Tynemouth in November 1870, and is preserved in the Newcastle Museum; its measurements are—wing 14·7 inches, tarsus 2·7, middle toe *s. u.* 1·4.

I believe but one British specimen of this Buzzard has been previously recorded—that mentioned by Mr. Gould in his 'Birds of Great Britain,' and referred to in 'The Ibis' for 1876, p. 366.

I may add, that during my visit to Newcastle I also saw Mr. Hancock's curious Sparrowhawk, to which I referred in 'The Ibis' for 1875, p. 479, and that I agree with that gentleman in considering it to be an abnormal specimen of *Accipiter nisus*.

Yours, &c.,

J. H. GURNEY.

Northrepps, November 24, 1877.

SIRS,—I beg to forward for insertion in 'The Ibis' an interesting notice with which I have been favoured by Major Fitzgerald, of Framingham Hall, Norfolk, on the subject of a fine specimen of *Huhua nipalensis* which lived several years in his possession, and which I had an opportunity of inspecting after it was stuffed.

Mr. Roberts, an experienced birdstuffer in Norwich, by whom this Owl has been mounted, informs me that it proved on dissection to be a female, and that the irides were a rich hazel with a very slight ochraceous tinge.

Major Fitzgerald tells me that this species "is not strictly nocturnal in its habits."

Yours &c.,

J. H. GURNEY.

Huhua nipalensis.—This specimen was taken from the nest, in a tree, in the Darjeeling District, Himalaya, either in the year 1861 or 1862, and from that period until September 1877 lived in my possession.

As well as I can remember, the bird was a solitary nestling, and took several months to assume its first plumage fully. Its food in confinement consisted of rabbit-flesh, rats, hedgehogs.

The *Huhua* is not a common bird, but is met with in most parts of the Himalaya in the more temperate valleys. The

natives assert that it carries off quite young pigs; but no instance of this has fallen under my own observation. The adult bird would, however, be quite capable of doing so.

In confinement the bird became quite tame, and would utter cries of pleasure at recognizing the hand that fed it. It was not confined to a cage, but allowed to roam about, and during cold weather kept in a glass house.

The bird under notice was, I think, a female; and during the period which might probably be its nesting-season, was in the habit of uttering a peculiar and incessant cry.

The bird died quite suddenly, though apparently in fine condition.

W. R. FITZGERALD,
Major, late Royal Artillery.

Framingham Hall, near Norwich.

November 13, 1877.

Simla, Sept. 29th, 1877.

GENTLEMEN,—I cannot presume to encumber your pages with a long dissertation on the genus *Batrachostomus*; and I can afford, I think, to overlook the personal attacks upon myself contained in the Marquis of Tweeddale's recent letter (*Ibis*, 1877, p. 388), in which he refers to certain species of this genus.

A monographic notice of the Indian, Burmese, and Malayan species of this genus will appear (as soon as space can be found for it) in a future number of 'Stray Feathers;' but in the mean time, I think, it is of some importance that ornithologists should not be misled by the Marquis of Tweeddale's, in *my* opinion, erroneous identifications, and I desire to place on record in your Journal, very briefly, my views in regard to two points raised in his Lordship's letter, viz. :—first, the distinctness of *Batrachostomus affinis* and *B. castaneus*; and, second, the distinctness of *B. punctatus* and *B. moniliger*.

First as to *B. affinis*, Blyth.

There exists in the Malay peninsula, besides the magnificent *B. auritus*, which cannot well be confounded with any other Asiatic form, two distinct rufous forms of *Batrachostomus* :—

The one, the larger, *B. javanensis* apud Blyth, with conspicuous white wing-spots, with the wing usually measuring from 4·75 to 5 inches, and with a bill from 1·3 to 1·4 wide at base, and from 1·37 to 1·49 straight from angle of gape to top of bill. I have *twenty* specimens of this form now before me. They vary a great deal in the tone of the upper and lower plumage—the upper surface from light dingy chestnut to a very deep rufous brown, and the lower surface correspondingly, though in a lesser degree; but all unmistakably belong to the same species.

The other, the smaller—*B. affinis* apud Blyth, with, in three specimens out of four, *no* white spots on the wings, with wings varying from 4·28 to 4·6*, and with bills varying in width at gape from 0·95 to 1·13, and in length from gape to tip from 1·05 to 1·33. I have *four* specimens of this form before me; one is *precisely* similar to the type. Three answer well to Blyth's description; but the fourth has some spots upon the wing, and *may*, perhaps, notwithstanding the extreme narrowness of its bill and short wings, belong to the other form, which it closely resembles, as it has the bill 1·33 in length, whereas in the other three specimens the bills are only 1·05, 1·1, and 1·2 in length.

Setting aside this possibly doubtful specimen, I have *three* specimens, at any rate, of typical *B. affinis*, all shot in the neighbourhood of Malacca—wings 4·28, 4·5, and 4·6, with tails 4·4 and 4·5—answering in every respect to Blyth's description, and which, in my opinion, no one who compares them with either type or description can possibly doubt to be the form described by Blyth as *B. affinis*.

I have also before me four chestnut *B. castaneus*; wings 5·2, 5·25, 5·25, 5·5. It seems to me that difference in size alone is sufficient to separate the two; *B. castaneus* is really more than double the bulk of *B. affinis*; but the whole character and colour of the plumage is also totally different. The plumage in *B. affinis* is of the same colour and character as that of *B. javanensis* apud Blyth; and both are clearly different, to any practised eye, from *B. castaneus*. The plumage of this

* Blyth gives the wing as 4·5.

latter is softer and silkier ; and the chestnut is brighter everywhere (but most conspicuously so on the throat and breast) in the dullest *B. castaneus* than the brightest *B. javanensis* or *B. affinis*.

I say nothing now of the grey white-mottled birds from Malacca, and the similar, though immediately distinguishable, ones from the Himalayas. I assert nothing as to the validity of Blyth's *B. affinis*, nor as to the correct name that this or *B. javanensis* apud Blyth should bear.

I merely assert that in the Malayan peninsula occur two forms, a larger and a smaller (both fully represented in my museum), agreeing alike with the descriptions and the types of *B. javanensis* and *B. affinis*, Blyth, and both absolutely and unmistakably distinct, and distinguishable at a glance from *B. castaneus*.

Secondly, as to *B. punctatus* and *B. moniliger*. I have *B. moniliger* both from the Travancore hills and from Ceylon perfectly identical. In no adult *B. moniliger* does the wing fall short of 4·7. In *B. punctatus*, on the other hand, of which several specimens have now, Mr. White informs me, been obtained, the wing appears to be always under 5·5 (in the type it is only 5·3) ; and though unquestionably there is a strong family resemblance between the males of *B. moniliger*, as sexed by Mr. Bourdillion (for I have no really reliable sexed specimens except his), and *B. punctatus* as described (I have not yet seen the rufous form of this), the difference between the two birds in every dimension, and even in plumage, is such that no one who compares them can ever confound the two.

One more point remains to be noticed. When referring to Mr. Hodgson's bird, the type of *Otothrix hodgsoni*, I said it was certainly an adult female by dissection. I said this on the strength of Mr. Hodgson's entry on the back of the plate in his own hand :—

“Darjeeling, towards Great Runjeet, about 4000 or 3000 feet. May 20, 1856. *Female*, young, and nest. Plumes full” &c. &c.

Here follows a full description of structure ; and he adds, “Young like mature, but duller hues ; nest nearly flat, a

soft mass of lichens, overlaid with a soft downy vegetable substance, blended into a sort of felt."

Now, when Mr. Hodgson enters the sex in his own hand, with a full structural description, he has invariably ascertained the sex by dissection.

But, as every one knows, a single dissection cannot always be relied on, injury by shot, disease, partial decomposition of the specimen will at times mislead the most careful observers, and they will put down, without any doubts in their own minds, a single specimen as male or female, and then find out later, when they come to deal with a series, that they have somehow made a mistake. Such cases, however, form the exception, and not the rule.

Therefore when I first wrote I thought it probable that Mr. Hodgson (although he had had only a single specimen before him) was correct in the sex which he had recorded, undoubtedly from dissection. But later, when I obtained Mr. Bourdillion's evidence, and other collateral evidence which I did not think it necessary to refer to, I began to entertain the probability that Mr. Hodgson had been in some way deceived. There is no uncertainty as to Mr. Hodgson's having been of opinion that he had made out the bird to be a female by dissection. The uncertainty is as to whether he was correct in that opinion, or whether, as will, at times, happen to the most accurate observers, he was misled by deceptive appearances due to any of the causes above referred to. Fortunately I shall be able to produce conclusive evidence on this moot point, and shall now only draw attention to Schlegel's remark (J. f. O. 1856, p. 460) :—"Bei allen indischen *Podargen* sind die Männchen grau, die Weibchen rostfarben."

Yours truly,

A. O. HUME.

P.S. (26th October).

I have only just discovered that I myself am, in a measure, to blame for the error into which Lord Tweeddale has (in my opinion) fallen, about *Batrachostomus castaneus*, *B. affinis*, and *B. javanensis* apud Blyth.

I find that, in writing up my notes for my former papers in regard to these species, I myself confused the dimensions I had recorded on separate scraps for the two Malayan forms, and gave for *B. affinis* what pertained to *B. javanensis*, and argued on the same accordingly.

For this I cry *peccavi*; but the main fact remains unchanged, viz. that, as I have throughout contended, *B. affinis* and *B. javanensis*, apud Blyth, are both quite distinct from *B. castaneus*.

SIRS,—In Part 2, vol. v. of ‘Stray Feathers,’ Mr. Hume has published some criticisms on certain species of the Phasianidæ, regarding which I desire to make a few remarks.

First (p. 118), referring to the supposed new species of *Polyplectron*, called *P. intermedius*, Mr. Hume, having found that it was the same as my *P. germani*, says that his description of the tail-feathers was so accurate that he is surprised I had not informed him that the two birds were the same in my letter to ‘The Ibis’ of June 1873. I could not give him the information he desired in the way indicated, for the simple reason that I never wrote any letter to ‘The Ibis,’ nor to any other journal, about his *Polyplectron*; and the footnote attached to Mr. Blanford’s able review of ‘Stray Feathers’ in ‘The Ibis’ of April 1873 had reference solely to some so-called species of the late Mr. G. R. Gray!

Mr. Hume’s next criticism (p. 138) is, that as I state the male of the bird I call *Euplocamus ignitus*, when immature, has the “flanks streaked with chestnut, and the central tail-feathers brown,” he wants to be informed (after describing a well-known stage of plumage observed in the young male *E. ignitus*) where the bird with “pale chestnut flanks, varied with purplish black,” mentioned by Sclater, is to come from, or what stage of *E. vieilloti* it represents. I regret very much to be obliged to say that I do not know. So far as I am concerned, and the opinion I gave, the case stands as follows:—What I meant by saying that the immature male of the bird I call *E. ignitus* had the flanks “streaked with chestnut,” was,

that in place of the pure white central line on the black flank-feathers seen in the adult, the immature bird had this part chestnut (and I believe I was perfectly correct in so stating, although in some adults a chestnut tinge on this part sometimes remains)—and also that the central rectrices were rufous, instead of snow-white, which they afterwards become. As to this bird mentioned by Mr. Sclater with its *entirely* chestnut flanks, varied with black, I know nothing. Mr. Sclater says he has seen specimens; consequently they do exist; but although I believed I had examined all the specimens of the Phasianidæ then existing in the museums of Leyden, London, Paris, &c., and also the living birds in the Gardens at Amsterdam, Antwerp, Rotterdam, London, and in the Jardin d'Acclimatation and Jardin des Plantes at Paris, I have no recollection of seeing such a bird. Certainly, if I had, and it was a good species, there was no reason why I should not have given a plate of it in my work. After all, may not this bird described by Latham be an immature *E. nobilis*? for he gives its habitat as Java, with a question, and it might very possibly have come from Borneo! I shall take the earliest opportunity of examining one of these chestnut-flanked birds, and state my opinion of it in this journal.

The third and last criticism of Mr. Hume is on the error I committed (in his opinion) in uniting the *Pucrasia castanea*, Gould, with *P. duvauceli*, Temm. Now, before replying to this, it will first be necessary for me to say a few words about the last-named species, which, from his remarks, I should judge to be entirely unknown to Mr. Hume. He says Prêtre's drawing in the 'Planches Coloriées' is a "vile thing, a wretched picture," and that, "barring the tail, it is equally unlike every species of the genus" (quite true), and condemns it *in toto*, so far as I can see, because it does not resemble *P. macrolopha*. Now I would state, in justice to Prêtre, that, although his drawing does not equal one of Mr. Wolf's, yet it is a very faithful representation of *P. duvauceli*, Temm. I have no hesitation in saying this; for I am perfectly conversant with his type (the original of the plate in the 'Planches Coloriées'), as the specimen is still, and always has

been, I believe, here in the Paris Museum ; and it was by means of this example and the *type* of *P. castanea* (which I purchased from Mr. Gould, and which is now in the Zoological Museum at Stuttgart) that I became aware the two were the same species, and consequently placed Mr. Gould's bird among the synonyms of *P. duvauceli*. From their appearance and general mode of coloration, we are fairly entitled to believe that *P. duvauceli* and *P. macrolopha* are as thoroughly distinct species as any that are to be found in the Phasianidæ. Besides the chestnut on the back and sides of the neck, the flank-feathers, perfectly exhibited in the plate in my work, differ entirely from any I have ever seen in any specimen of *P. macrolopha* ; and I have examined a great many. Mr. Gould's plate does not show these correctly : the chestnut colouring is exaggerated in its extent ; and the black feathers with their light edges are almost entirely suppressed, a few only showing just above the leg. Temminck's text, it is true, does not describe his plate accurately, but leans more to *P. macrolopha* ; but as he says "La gravure ayant été faite depuis *longtemps*, même avant la publication des deux ouvrages anglais où se trouvent de tres-bonnès figures de notre oiseau," it is most probable that when he wrote his description he took it from an example of *P. macrolopha*, instead of from the specimen figured—which was in the Paris Museum, and which he may not have seen for a long time, and was confounded in his mind with the newly figured *P. macrolopha*. However this may be, the *types* show that *P. castanea* and *P. duvauceli* are the same species, and quite different from *P. macrolopha* ; and I do not believe Mr. Hume will ever succeed in proving them all to be one species.

D. G. ELLIOT.

Paris, Dec. 8, 1877.

Obituary of the late Mr. R. Swinhoe, F.R.S.

ROBERT SWINHOE, whose premature death on the 28th of October last we all have to deplore, was born in Calcutta on the 1st of September, 1836. He was brought to England at

an early age, and educated at King's College, London, of which he was made an Honorary Fellow in 1863. On leaving King's College he matriculated at the University of London in 1853, and in the following year passed as a supernumerary Interpreter for the Consular Service in China. During his residence in China he acted as Vice-Consul and Consul at Amoy, Shanghai, Ningpo, and Chefoo, as well as in Formosa. His expeditions included :—a journey up the Yangtze river as far as the interior of Szechuen; the circumnavigation of the island of Formosa; a visit to Hainan; and a journey to Peking, whither he accompanied, as interpreter, the English forces under General Napier and Sir Hope Grant. His last station was Chefoo, whither he had gone, with the hope of regaining health, in 1873. His malady, however, increasing, Swinhoe quitted China in October 1873, and, retiring from the Consular Service on a pension, lived in London till his death.

During his stay in China, Swinhoe devoted the whole of his spare time to working at the natural history of the different places at which he resided, ornithology occupying a large share of his attention. On the eve of his first departure from England he made the acquaintance of our Member, Mr. H. Stevenson. It thus came to pass that some of Swinhoe's first collections were consigned to Mr. Stevenson, and that a portion of the birds passed into the Norwich Museum, where they now are. But during his whole period of work Swinhoe always reserved an extensive series of specimens for his private collection, and used them for reference in compiling the numerous papers that he was constantly writing on his favourite subject. When Swinhoe first began his study of Chinese ornithology our knowledge of the birds of that country may be said to have been almost nothing. No general account of the birds of China had ever been published; and all that was known of them was of the most fragmentary description. The pages of the 'Proceedings of the Zoological Society' and of this Journal testify to Swinhoe's unremitting energy at his favourite subject. Of all the papers he wrote on it, the "Revised List of Chinese Birds," published in the 'Proceedings'

for 1871, gives the best summary of what he has done to advance our knowledge of the Chinese avifauna.

During the latter part of the time that Swinhoe was working at the birds of the Chinese littoral, the interior of the country was being most ably investigated by Père Armand David; so that China, instead of being the *terra incognita* as regards our knowledge of its birds that it was twenty years ago, may now rank amongst the fairly explored countries of the globe.

Swinhoe's communications to this Journal commenced in 1860, after which scarcely a number, and certainly no volume, appeared without a contribution to its pages from him. His last communication to us bears the date of the same month as that of his death; and the fine Formosan species there described and figured, from a specimen obtained by Prof. Steere, supplements his own important discoveries in the same island.

Swinhoe was elected an Honorary Member of the British Ornithologists' Union in 1862, and passed to the list of Ordinary Members at his own choice in 1876. He was a Member of several of the scientific societies of London, as well as a Fellow of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1876. It is much to be hoped that Mr. Swinhoe's fine collection of Chinese birds may be kept together in its entirety, and find a home in some public institution or private museum where the specimens will remain accessible, as they always were in their late owner's possession, to his brother workers in science.